

on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); United States v. Midgett, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. Plaintiff’s response and medical records are merely general objections. In any event, the court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. Plaintiff’s response and medical records do not address the untimeliness of his complaint or demonstrate extraordinary circumstances to justify extending the section 205(g) filing deadline. Thus, the court adopts the conclusions in the M&R that the complaint was untimely and that the court should grant defendant’s motion to dismiss.

In sum, the court OVERRULES plaintiff’s objections to the M&R [D.E. 22, 23], ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 21], GRANTS defendant’s motion to dismiss the complaint [D.E. 13], and DISMISSES this action. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 18 day of June 2020.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge